

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action of December 21, 2010 the Office noted that claims 1-20 were pending and rejected claims 1-20. In this amendment claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18 and 20 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

**CLAIM OBJECTION**

Claims 19 and 20 stand objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that ADPU should be spelled out. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the objection. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of the claims.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 3-5, 11, 16, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office asserts that a trade name is used. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vandewalle, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0082847. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Vandewalle discloses "at least one data object associated to at least one first reference local to the card to locally address and execute the data object," as in claim 1.

A dynamic constructing of the mapping between the labels and APDU commands is provided by Vandewalle ¶ 0029 by the card (skeleton) to a terminal (client proxy) upon reception of an appropriate APDU message, possibly upon a first invocation of a method Vandewalle ¶¶ 0032-0034.

However, there is no indication that this appropriate APDU message comprises a logical identifier of a method.

In particular, given that the labels m, n, o are assumed to be first local references, the logical identifier in the message should be another identifier. Neither the indication of these labels nor another identifier is taught in this APDU message of Vandewalle.

On page 4 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Vandewalle Figs. 5a and 5b and ¶ 0030 discloses "a register comprising a logical identifier of said object and the at least one first local reference," as in claim 1.

The Office asserts the third byte in the header of an APDU command as a logical identifier. This third byte is however not used at the client program level, thus contrasting with the invention in which the logical identifier is used by the high-level application.

On pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Vandewalle Figs. 2 and 5; and ¶¶ 0023; 0034 and 0030 disclose "a means adapted, on reception of a first message from a terminal, said message comprising said logical identifier of the data object, to communicate to the terminal at least one second local reference of the data object, obtained from said at least one first local reference," as in claim 1.

The Office asserts an APDU response message is equivalent to a second local reference of the data object. This is surprising since this response message is not a reference to a data object, it is only a response from the data object (i.e. the invoked method) but not a reference to it, i.e. a reference that is used to locally address and execute this data object.

Further, the Office asserts some APDU commands including the third byte in the header used to identify the specific method to be invoked. This is in line with the fact that the Office considers any APDU response message as the second local reference.

However, these are APDU commands used when the methods are invoked and not an initial command to obtain/publish the

methods of the smart card. Such an initial command appears to be the "appropriate APDU message" of Vandewalle ¶ 0034 that sends back the decoding table.

Further, the Office asserts the conversion of a response by the card skeleton to anticipate the "second local reference obtained from the first local reference".

The APDU commands cannot be considered as the claimed second local reference since they do not derive from the first local reference, i.e., the labels m, n, o.

The Office fails to demonstrate that the second local reference (addressing the data object for execution) is obtained or "derives" from the labels m, n, o.

It is also noted in Vandewalle Figs. 3 and 4 that the translation using the decoding table occurs only in the processing direction from the terminal (proxy) to the smart card (skeleton) [see the direction of the arrows] and not in the reverse direction.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Vandewalle fails to anticipate claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Vandewalle in view of Lagosanto, U.S. Patent

No. 6,807,561. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Lagosanto adds nothing to the deficiencies of Vandewalle as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Vandewalle and Lagosanto, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 9.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg.No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb